

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/074,094	02/12/2002	Kenneth J. Schlager	4328-00005	6713
75	90 12/22/2003		EXAMINER	
Kenneth J. Schlager 744 Winston Way			PHASGE, ARUN S	
Hartland, WI 53029			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1753	
			DATE MAILED: 12/22/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No	Applicant(s)				
			06			
Office Action Summary	10/074,094	SCHLAGER ET A	- 110			
	Examiner	Art Unit	NY			
The MAILING DATE of this communication	Arun S. Phasge	1753				
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cove	r sheet with the correspondence add	dress -			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by ste - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the meanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	N. R 1.136(a). In no event, how. reply within the statutory minited will apply and will expire	ever, may a reply be timely filed nimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this co	mmunication.			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _						
<u> </u>	—— his action is non-fina	I.				
3) Since this application is in condition for alloclosed in accordance with the practice unde	wance except for for	mal matters prosecution as to the	merits is			
Disposition of Claims		,				
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are pending in the applicati	ion.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are without		ation.				
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	·					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	d/or election require	nent.				
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ a						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	he drawing(s) be held	in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corr	ection is required if the	e drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFF	R 1.121(d).			
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the	attached Office Action or form PTC	D-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of:	ign priority under 35	U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
 Certified copies of the priority docume 	ents have been recei	ved.				
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority docume	nts have been recei	ved in Application No.				
 Copies of the certified copies of the preaction from the International Bure 	Tonty documents ha	ve been received in this National S a))	tage			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a li	st of the certified co	pies not received				
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dome since a specific reference was included in the 37 CFR 1.78.	stic priority under 35 first sentence of the	U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional a specification or in an Application D	application) ata Sheet.			
a) The translation of the foreign language p	provisional application	n has been received.				
14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dome reference was included in the first sentence of	stic priority under 35 the specification or	U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a in an Application Data Sheet. 37 C	specific FR 1.78.			
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 II	nterview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s).				
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 	5) 🗍 1	lotice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-1				

Art Unit: 1753

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claims 3-4, 7, 12, 19 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. The function of the structure provides no further limitation to the prior claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-22 are rejected as failing to define the invention in the manner required by 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

The claim(s) are narrative in form and replete with indefinite and functional or operational language. The structure which goes to make up the device must be clearly and positively specified. The structure must be organized and correlated in such a manner as to present a complete operative device. Note the format of the claims in the patent(s) cited.

. -

Application/Control Number: 10/074,094

Art Unit: 1753

Page 3

Claim Rejections - 35 USC \$ 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-7, 10-12, 17-21, 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Knieper et al. (Knieper), U.S. Patent 6,238,546 B1.

The Knieper patent discloses the claimed method and apparatus for the disinfection flow cell for disinfection of water wherein the water passes through the flow line within the flow rate comprising the spaced electrodes within the claimed range and types of electrodes, and power supply ranges (see columns 3-5). The reference further discloses the generation of hydroxyl radicals and the use of an ultrasonic transducer (see col 8, lines 36-54). The reference further does teach the use of reverse polarity (see col. 4, lines 8-18). The passage of water

Application/Control Number: 10/074,094

Art Unit: 1753

Page 4

through the cell with the application of the current would produce the claimed products and/or results.

Therefore, since the Knieper patent discloses each and every limitation, the claims are anticipated.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Art Unit: 1753

Claims 9, 13-16 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knieper as applied to claims above, and further in view of Doring, U.S. Patent 5,738,778.

The Knieper patent does not disclose the use of the spectrometer to monitor the quality of the water. The Doring patent is cited to show the conventional use of spectrometers to monitor and control electrolytic systems (see col. 8, lines 45-67).

Consequently, the invention as a whole would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the disclosure of the Knieper patent with the teachings of the Doring patent, because the Doring patent teaches the use of the monitoring of the system using a spectrometer. The exact size and shape of the cell would have been an engineering modification well within the skill of the ordinary artisan, unless the shape modification produces an unexpected result.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arun S. Phasge whose telephone number is

Art Unit: 1753

(703) 308-2528. The examiner can normally be reached on MONDAY-THURSDAY, 7:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nam X Nguyen can be reached on (703) 308-3322. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9310.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

Arun S. Phasge

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1753

asp